



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,226	03/18/2005	Michel Magne	259346US0PCT	6706
22850	7590	10/29/2008	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			WEDDLE, ALEXANDER MARION	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1792		
		NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		10/29/2008		ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/510,226	MAGNE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ALEXANDER WEDDLE	1792	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ALEXANDER WEDDLE.

(3) JACOB DOUGHTY.

(2) MICHAEL KORNAKOV.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 October 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: Li, "Chemical Modification of Wood" (1999), Vaca-Garcia, "Cellulose Esterification with Fatty Acids" (1998).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Parties discussed 1) whether references were properly combined, 2) whether data to show unexpected results are available, and 3) whether clarifying amendments may be submitted. Arguments were well-taken, and no agreement was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/A. W /
Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/Michael Kornakov/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792